

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY)	MDL Docket No. 06-1791 VRW
TELECOMMUNICATIONS RECORDS)	
LITIGATION, MDL No. 1791)	Relates to Case Nos.
)	
This Document Relates To:)	
)	07-cv-1187-VRW
<u>Robert Clayton, et al. v. AT&T</u>)	07-cv-1242-VRW
<u>Communications of the Southwest, Inc.,</u>)	07-cv-1323-VRW
<u>et al.</u> , (W.D.Mo.))	07-cv-1324-VRW
<u>USA v. Steve Gaw, et al.</u> , (E.D.Mo.))	07-cv-1326-VRW
<u>USA v. Kurt Adams, et al.</u> , (D. Me.))	(N.D. Cal. Number not yet
<u>USA v. Zulima V. Farber, et al.</u> , (D.N.J.))	assigned to Vermont case)
<u>USA v. Anthony J. Palermino,</u>)	
<u>et al.</u> , (D.Ct.))	
<u>USA v. James Volz, et al.</u> , (D.Vt.))	
)	ORDER

Having considered the parties' motions, the court ORDERS the following
schedule for briefing and oral argument in the six above-captioned cases:

March 30, 2007	Parties file reply briefs to dispositive motions already pending in Connecticut and Vermont. All movants file supplemental briefs on dispositive motions already pending in State Cases. Said briefs shall be limited to addressing legal issues arising from the transfer of State Cases to the Northern District of California, including choice of law issues and issues relating to relevant Ninth Circuit precedent that were not previously briefed.
April 30, 2007	All respondents file responses to the supplemental briefs ordered above. Said responses shall be limited as described above for the supplemental briefs.
May __, 2007 or June __, 2007	Oral argument on all dispositive motions already pending in State Cases. (The state officials and interveners respectfully request oral argument on these motions, the date to be set at the Court's convenience.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: _____

VAUGHN R. WALKER
United States District Chief Judge